R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 012 867 AC 001 326

CONFERENCE ON YOUNG PEOPLES' ATTITUDES TOWARD AMERICAN LIBERTIES (SUFFERN, OCTOBER 21-23, 1966).

BY- WESTIN, ALAN F. AND OTHERS
COLUMBIA UNIV., NEW YORK, CTR. FOR RES. AND EDUC.

PUB DATE 66

GRANT OEG-1-6-061554-1674
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.40 35P.

DESCRIPTORS- *RESEARCH METHODOLOGY, *YOUTH, *ATTITUDES, *CIVIL RIGHTS, *RESEARCH PROBLEMS, CHANGING ATTITUDES, SCHOOL ATTITUDES, SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT, CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, SURVEYS, INTERVIEWS, FAMILY ATTITUDES, SOCIOECONOMIC INFLUENCES, GAMES, STUDENT OPINION, POLITICAL OPINION, CITIZENSHIP, LEARNING PROCESSES, EDUCATIONAL EXPERIMENTS, CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND EDUCATION IN AMERICAN LIBERTIES,

THE CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND EDUCATION IN AMERICAN LIBERTIES AT COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PROPOSES TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION ABOUT LIBERTY, JUSTICE, AND EQUALITY IN THE NATION'S SCHOOLS THROUGH A PROGRAM OF BASIC SCHOLARSHIP AND THROUGH THE DEVELOPMENT OF EXPERIMENTAL CURRICULAR MATERIALS. A CONFERENCE OF CIVIC LEADERS WAS HELD TO DISCUSS HOW THE CENTER MIGHT STUDY THE DEVELOPMENT IN YOUNG PEOPLE OF ATTITUDES ABOUT CIVIL LIBERTIES AND FREEDOM IN AMERICAN SOCIETY. THE GROUP SEEMED AGREED THAT THE CENTER SHOULD EXPLOIT ONGOING RESEARCH, SUCH AS NATIONAL OPINION POLLS, AND SHOULD UNDERTAKE SMALL, SPECIALIZED RESEARCH AT THE SAME TIME IT IS DEVELOPING CURRICULUM. SURVEY RESEARCH COULD BE USED, ESPECIALLY TO ASSESS THE IMPACT OF PARTICULAR INTERVENTIONS INTO THE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS, BUT EFFORTS SHOULD BE MADE TO MODIFY AND SUPPLEMENT SURVEYS WITH SUCH TECHNIQUES AS GAMES, ETHNOLOGICAL EXPLORATION, AND NON-RESPONSIVE INQUIRY. SURVEY QUESTIONS NEED NOT BE SHALLOW AND DEPTH INTERVIEWING COULD BE HARNESSED TO THE SURVEY TECHNIQUE WITH THE RESULTS CODED IN VARIOUS WAYS AND RIGOROUSLY MANIPULATED. THE POLITICAL LEARNING PROCESS, ESPECIALLY IN THE EARLY YEARS, AND THE POLITICS AND SOCIOLOGY OF THE SCHOOL SHOULD BE MAJOR RESEARCH TARGETS FOR THE NEXT THREE YEARS. (LY)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED012867

REPORT

on the

CONFERENCE ON YOUNG PEOPLE'S ATTITUDES TOWARD AMERICAN LIBERTIES

Motel on the Mountain, Suffern, New York

October 21 - 23, 1966

Sponsored by the

CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND EDUCATION IN AMERICAN LIBERTIES

Columbia University

Under a grant from the Division of Adult and Vocational Research
U. S. Office of Education
Contract #OEG-1-6-061554-1674

I. BACKGROUND OF THE CENTER

The Center for Research and Education in American Liberties was created by Columbia University and Teachers College to unite scholarly analysis, educational innovation, and civic energy behind basic reform in the teaching of liberty and citizenship in America. The Center has a four dimensional program which it will pursue in the coming decade.

First, a group of scholars from Columbia and other universities, specialists in law, the social and behavioral sciences, and the humanities, will meet for two years to study and describe the realities of liberty, equality, and justice in America in the late 1960's. They will compare our current situation with American circumstances in the era of the Founding Fathers and at selected points during our historical development from frontier society to industrial power. Comparisons will be made of American practice with that of other democratic nations, totalitarian societies, and the newly-emerging nations. Finally, the scholar's group will look at events in the coming decade that will have profound effects on our patterns of liberty--developments in technology, urbanization, inter-group relations, cultural trends, and international affairs.

Second, the facts and ideas developed by these scholars will be used by specialists in education and communication to develop new instructional programs for presenting American liberties. Case-studies, discussion materials, films, and fresh social-science analyses will be developed, all geared to imaginative new trends in educational theory. The central goal will be to develop in students and adults alike a firm understanding of the American tradition of freedom, a commitment as citizens to use this freedom to advance social progress, and a critical habit of mind in dealing with the problems of choice and balance that our system of freedom presents.

Third, the Center will develop pilot programs for training teachers and adult-education leaders in these new ideas and educational approaches. No improvement of instruction can succeed unless hundreds of thousands of teachers are brought into institutes and courses which communicate this material to them. Teachers who themselves grapple with the dilemmas of liberty and realize how the solution of most problems facing American society depend on free inquiry and democratic values will be ready--and eager--to communicate this understanding to students.

Fourth, the Center has on its Board of Governors a group of outstanding civic leaders from the fields of business, labor, government, education, law, and religion. These men and women will participate actively in the discussion of what American liberties mean today, how to present these more effectively in education, and, most important, how to support the introduction of fresh materials and exciting teaching into the schools and the adult-education area.

II. BACKGROUND OF THE CONFERENCE

The Conference on Young People's Attitudes Toward American Liberties, organized by the Center for Research and Education in American Liberties, was held at the Motel on the Mountain, Suffern, New York, on October 21, 22, and 23, 1966. Its purpose was to bring together a group of lawyers, social scientists, and persons from public life to discuss and suggest how the Center might profitably study the development in young people of attitudes about civil liberties and freedom in American society.

As we have said, it is the purpose of the Center to improve the quality of education about liberty, justice, and equality in the nation's schools through a program of basic scholarship and through the development of experimental curricular materials in the area of civil liberties. In contemplating our tasks in the area of curriculum development, it seemed clear that the greater our initial understanding of the attitudinal structure of the populations with which we would be dealing, the more likely we would be able to intervene in the educational process sensitively and with maximum effect. In one sense, our need is for an attitudinal map of American youth which will serve as a tool and a guide for our work over the next two years in developing a sequential educational system. At a more fundamental level, however, we are concerned with the much more complex problem of how young people's attitudes toward liberty develop, and with identifying the independent variables--socio-economic, religious, familia, etc.--which influence the formation of attitudes. It seems to us that unless one knows at what stages in a child's development his perceptions of liberty issues become differentiated and in what ways, it is very difficult to think sensibly about designing classroom materials. Thus we are concerned with basic scientific research into attitudes but with research as the handmaiden of educational reform.

Given our conviction that a high level of sophistication about political socialization and the process by which attitudes are formed is necessary to sensible program design, our next step was to determine how much is presently known about young people's attitudes towards liberty. An effort was also begun to define the most profitable avenues of research along which the Center might move if it were decided that existing data and theory were inadequate, and that additional work had to be undertaken to provide the kind of social-scientific understanding vital to sound educational innovation. This initial phase of our work involved a review of the existing literature concerning attitudes towards civil liberties in order to achieve an overview of what had been done; four distinct analytical approaches having varying degrees of relevance to the problems concerning us, were identified.

The first derives from the massive study of The Authoritarian Personality published by Adorno and his associates in 1951 and deals with the relationship of personality and early childhood experience to political attitudes.[1] A second approach is taken by national survey organizations such as Elmo Roper Associates and the American Institute of Public Opinion (the Gallup Organization) which, over the years, have asked short, specific questions about civil liberties of stratified national samples.[2] A third, and in many ways the most interesting body of literature, is made up of specialized studies of small populations done by political scientists and sociologists in an effort to explore the universe of values and attitudes about civil liberties in a more subtle and sophisticated fashion than has been done with the national samples.[3] The final analytical approach involves the use of non-survey techniques--depth interviews, direct observation, games, and storyboards--to uncover constellations of attitudes.[4]

To carry through properly with this process of sifting existing theory and research methods and to help decide the sort of work the Center might sensibly undertake, application was made to the United States Office of Education for a grant to enable us to bring together at a week-end conference a number of experts, in survey research and attitude measurement, in substantive civil liberties problems, and in education. Through this, we hoped to get their reactions to the options and questions facing us and to heighten our sophistication by exposing our preliminary thoughts to examination and criticism.

Pre-Conference Planning

In preparing for the conference, preliminary conversations were held with several leading social scientists concerning the proper make-up of the group and how its agenda should be arranged.

To explore the range of questions on the approaches to attitudinal studies and their value, the Center held several meetings with scholars at Teachers College. These included Professors Erling Hunt, Robert Thorndike, Arno Bellack, Elizabeth Hagen, and Sam Ball. Professor Alan Westin, Mrs. Minna Post Peyser, and Mr. Richard Morgan of the Center's Executive Staff also met with Professor Herbert Hyman of the Department of Sociology of Columbia University for extended discussions of the Conference.

In addition to reviewing the strengths and weaknesses of conventional survey research techniques (the sorts used in commercial and smaller scholarly studies), the participants in the conversations also considered the possibility of conducting a depth survey which relied on direct open-ended interviews following presentations of a motivator--a story, play, film, or game. These interviews could be carried on for as long a period of time as the interviewer

deemed necessary and the subject appeared to be responsive. The object of this approach would be to develop a more detailed picture of the individual's attitudinal structure than can be achieved through "cold" responses to questions which do not engage the subject's emotions.

This idea of the motivating presentations was viewed as particularly subtle and challenging. Further discussions explored the use of three 3-5 minute films, each centered around a situation involving a concept of liberty, equality, or justice. The film offers advantages in realism, professionalism in production, and exact reproduction, in every instance, of the motivating experience. It was also felt that the playscripts used successfully by many human relations organizations or simply the reading of a story should also be investigated. As a contribution to the field of opinion surveys, it was suggested that interviews might also include a series of responses to specific, conventional survey questions. The data collected from these questions might furnish valuable methodological comparisons when placed alongside the data collected in the depth interview.

At a more fundamental level, however, those taking part in the preliminary conversations felt that the participants in the conference should not address themselves at the outset to the techniques which might be employed, but rather should consider the sorts of questions which might be asked about the attitudes of the young and about the learning process. Such primary intellectual work, of course, involves choices between competing social scientific theories, and it was considered vital that the Center's leadership have the benefit of the reflections of a diverse group of scholars and commentators concerning the assumptions underlying various research designs.

Based on these preliminary conversations, a set of working assumptions and guiding questions was drawn up to focus the work of the conference. (Official Agenda at Appendix I.)

It was decided that the opening session on the evening of October 21 should be used by Professor Westin to inform the group of the Center's concerns and to suggest the sorts of questions which it hoped the conference would explore. The morning session on Saturday, October 22, was set aside for discussion of the basic problems of research into the subtle and elusive attitudes involved in civil liberties issues and for consideration of the basic questions the Center should be asking. The session on Saturday afternoon was planned to produce a wide-ranging discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of survey research techniques for the investigation of young peoples' attitudes. The Saturday evening session was devoted for a consideration of non-survey techniques (such as depth interviews and games) which might prove useful. The final session on Sunday morning was reserved for following-up comments and suggestions made during the previous day which seemed especially relevant to the tasks of the Center and required further exploration by the group.

III. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS AND STAFF

STAFF

Professor Alan F. Westin
Director

Mrs. Minna Post Peyser
Associate Director

Mr. Raymond E. Smith
Research Associate

Mr. Richard E. Morgan
Conference Director

Mrs. Heather Feldman
Administrative Assistant

Miss Mary O'Melveny
Assistant to the Director

Miss Alice Kwartler
Editorial Assistant

* * * * *

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Professor Christian Bay
Department of Political Science
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta,
Canada

Dr. George Carnett
Research Coordinator
Research Branch
Division of Elementary and
Secondary Research
United States Office of Education
Washington, D. C.

Dr. Robert E. Cleary
Assistant Director
The American Political Science
Association
Washington, D. C.

Mr. W. H. Ferry
Center for the Study of Democratic
Institutions
Santa Barbara, California

Dr. Charles R. Foster
Specialist for Social Science
Curriculum and Demonstration Branch
United States Office of Education
Washington, D. C.

Professor Frederick Frey
Department of Political Science
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Professor Edgar Z. Friedenberg
Department of Sociology
University of California, Davis
Davis, California

Professor Robert K. Greenawalt
Columbia University Law School
New York, New York

Professor Herbert Hyman
Department of Sociology
Columbia University
New York, New York

Dr. Nathan Jacobsen
District Superintendent
New York, New York

Dr. Kent Jennings
Survey Research Center
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Professor John Johnstone
National Opinion Research Center
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

Professor Kurt Lang
Department of Sociology
State University of New York,
Stony Brook
Stony Brook, Long Island, New York

Dr. Robert S. Lee
I. B. M.
New York, New York

Professor Thomas R. Leidy
Associate Director
Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana

Professor Louis Levine
Yeshiva University
New York, New York

Professor Seymour M. Lipset
Department of Social Relations
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Professor Lester Milbrath
Department of Political Science
State University of New York, Buffalo
Buffalo, New York

Dr. Herman H. Remmers
Division of Educational Reference
Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana

Mr. Lawrence Rogin
Director
Department of Education
AFL - CIO
Washington, D. C.

Professor Arnold A. Rogow
Department of Political Science
The City College of New York
New York, New York

Professor Erling O. Schild
Department of Social Relations
The Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, Maryland

Professor Hanan Charles Selvin
The University of Rochester
Rochester
New York

Professor Harold M. Stahmer
Department of Religion
Columbia University
New York, New York

IV. MAJOR THEMES OF THE PRESENTATIONS AND COMMENTS

The Conference was convened at 8:30 PM on Friday, October 21. Mrs. Minna Post Peyser, Associate Director of the Center, welcomed the participants and introduced Professor Alan F. Westin, Director of the Center, who addressed the group.

Professor Westin's remarks were organized around the theme of civil liberties and social change, with special emphasis on the dramatic changes taking place in American education. He stressed the importance of bringing scholarly resources to bear in an interdisciplinary fashion on the new problems which confront us, and suggested that it may be possible to take advantage of the educational system's being in flux and crisis to achieve a reforming impact impossible in more settled and self-confident times. The requisites of such impact are a sophisticated scholarly "content" which explores the implications for traditional American values of new and emerging realities, and an imaginative translation of these insights into different classroom materials which will be responsive to the needs of various age groups and special populations. In order to have impact on children in the learning process, the Center must operate and innovate on the basis of carefully examined assumptions about socialization and the development of values. While it would certainly be unwise to postpone the development of programs in the hope of eventually developing perfect social-scientific understanding of ways in which attitudes toward liberty, equality and justice are formed, the Center is determined to deepen its understanding of socialization and learning at the same time that it innovates. It is recognized that no matter how much research is done there is always a chance of going wrong on the basis of inadequate theory--action cannot be free of risks. But Professor Westin saw the Conference as the beginning

of a continuing commitment of the Center--coordinate with its commitments to civil liberties scholarship and development of educational systems--to the enrichment of understanding how children in America develop civic values and come to terms with the political system.

The Nature of the Inquiry

The Saturday morning session was chaired by Professor Seymour Martin Lipset, of Harvard University, and brief presentations were made by Professor Christian Bay, of the University of Alberta, and by Professor Lester Milbrath, of the State University of New York at Buffalo.

Professor Bay warned against the Center's becoming so involved with research, theory building, and educational technology that it loses sight of the radical and liberating nature of good education. The clearest proposition to emerge from the work thus far on young people's political attitudes is that the more libertarian the subjects, the more they tend to be intelligent, intellectual, and to do well in school. It is distressing that there has been little theorizing as to why this should be so. One possible explanation sees the causal link between liberality and intelligence as psychological, with the more intelligent youngster achieving a superior integration of his personality and being less anxiety-ridden and needful of repressive behavior than his slower, more authoritarian counterpart. Such tentative notions might well be followed up.

On the whole, the Center should spend more time thinking about how to maximize the liberating influence of good general education, and less on attempting to develop any particular body of material or neat package of libertarian principles.

Professor Milbrath discussed his current research on young people's perceptions of the legitimacy of the American political system. In this design, legitimacy is measured in terms of understanding and attachment to constitutional norms, and the extent to which young people perceive the boundaries of state power and limitations on the coercive activities of public officials. This conception of legitimacy made the work, in effect, a study of attitudes toward civil liberties. Moreover, it also sought to determine the extent to which a dose of formal instruction about constitutional principles would alter attitudes. To do this, some 600 students in an 11th grade American history course were divided into groups; each group was given a different "mix" of tests and instruction about civil liberties. A group was controlled so that the researcher could make some determination as to the impact of the instruction.

The results of these short term interventions were discouraging. Professor Milbrath suggested that for populations of this age (that is, at the 11th grade level), attitudes concerning constitutional boundaries and fair play are not malleable. They cannot be substantially altered through short lectures or discussions.

The Center, whatever it might choose to do by way of research, should seriously consider educational techniques in which the students participates to the maximum possible extent. Only in this way will the student's emotions be sufficiently engaged to allow the instructor an opportunity for meaningful discussion of values which affect a person's attitudes toward the constitutional order and his perceptions of legitimate exercises of public power.

Professor Harold Stahmer, of the Department of Religion at Barnard College, commented on Professor Milbrath's presentation and emphasized the twin

difficulties of developing definitions of liberty and legitimacy, and the very great problems which are raised by any attempt to achieve a real clash of values in public school classrooms.

Professor Frederick Frey, of the Department of Political Science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, pointed out that as long as discensus exists in the community as to the nature of constitutional liberties and the limits of permissible opinion and behavior, perhaps it is asking too much of the schools to stimulate the sort of deep-cutting discussion of values which Milbrath desires. It is also necessary to remember that we know very little about the durability of young people's attitudes. It may be that the constellation of adolescent attitudes which Milbrath sought to describe and to change by short-term means, do not persist to become civic values of the individual. The questions of aging and re-socialization should be investigated.

The final commentator on the morning's papers was Professor Kurt Lang of the Department of Sociology of the State University of New York at Stony Brook. Professor Lang warned against overcommitment to teaching about liberty and suggested that the Center should concentrate on young people's attitudes and responses toward micro-liberty situations. A great deal can be discovered about a student's sense of community fair play by exploring his attitude on problems within the school where he is forced to act, make judgments, and relate to authority.

It is also necessary to be conscious of the differentiation of young people, and to develop research designs which would explore attitudes in terms of social status and interest group identifications of the respondents.

At the conclusion of the comments Professor Lipset remarked that a special problem was created with regard to civil liberties attitudes by the

emphasis within many schools upon political neutrality. The public posture of the school encourages a sort of civil quietism and discourages political commitment. This sterile ideology of non-involvement must surely be taken into account in studying the development of attitudes concerning civil liberties.

Survey Research Techniques

The Saturday afternoon session was called to order after lunch by its chairman, Professor Herbert Hyman of the Department of Sociology of Columbia University. Professor Hyman remarked that the title of this session (Survey Research Techniques for Investigating Young People's Attitudes Toward American Liberties) should not be taken as pre-judging the issue. He suggested that while survey research techniques were becoming more subtle and more flexible, it might be that the meaningful insights for the Center would be obtained in other ways, or by combinations of survey and non-survey techniques. The potential of survey research was treated in two presentations, one by Professor Herman Remmers, former director of the Purdue Opinion Poll, and one by Professor M. Kent Jennings of the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan.

Professor Remmers carefully inventoried survey research techniques to see how particular approaches might be employed to aid the Center in discovering where it could best intervene in the educational process. It was pointed out that survey research might help the Center after its work had been done and after its materials had been used, to judge what its impact had been on attitudinal structures.

In developing research designs, the Center should remember that as the child acquires "human nature" and equips himself to live in a society of human

beings, his attitudinal patterns largely constitute his personality. He acquires attitudes like those of his parents, his friends, and the primary groups of which he is a member. As he grows older, secondary groups and temporary face-to-face groups become more important. In general, the closer the relationship between the individual and significant others, the greater the influence of such relationships for developing attitudes.

While we need to learn much more about processes of interaction and learning, there is a good deal of evidence that intergroup attitudes are learned and manifested in early childhood--probably in the first four to six years. On the basis of long-term congruence between the findings of the Purdue Opinion Poll (a sample of high school students across the nation) and the Gallup and Roper surveys, it can be argued that young people's attitudes toward liberty are fairly durable and survive into the adult years as stable civic values.

Finally, the question was raised of whether young people's attitudes toward liberty have changed appreciably in the past decade. Data developed by the Purdue Opinion Poll (see Appendix II) was submitted to suggest an increasing liberality among young people. The change, however, is slight, and Professor Remmers cautioned against over-optimism in this regard.

Professor Jennings paper reported a piece of ongoing research at the Survey Research Center: a study of political socialization among high school seniors. Professor Jennings discussed first the general purposes and design of the study; second, the problems of research among school populations; third, the kinds of attitudes toward liberty which were investigated and the directionality of attitudes in this area; fourth, the sources of constraint on the teaching of civil liberty values; and fifth, suggestions as to future research designs.

Regarding the directionality of attitudes towards civil liberties, the SRC data seemed to indicate that the parent-child congruency of attitudes may not be as strong as many had intuitively believed or earlier studies tended to show. It is possible that the transmission of values from parent to child is more tenuous than existing models of the socialization process suggest.

Reflecting on future research designs and especially about the problems of the Center, Professor Jennings suggested that some form of survey research be combined with other means of data gathering. Some phenomena of interest to the Center--the content and handling of curriculum for example--can only be adequately comprehended through other approaches. Other techniques will also provide cross-checks and supplements to survey data. Supplementary approaches include such non-reactive and unobtrusive techniques as surveying school records of rewards and sanctions, semantic analysis of students' written work, analysis of the seating patterns in the classroom and group formation within the school, survey of student personnel forms, unobtrusive recordings of informal conversation, non-reactive experimental situations, and surveys of library withdrawals.

Finally, the importance to the Center of developmental research was emphasized. Rather than confining its investigations to pre-adult years, it is extremely important for the Center to extend inquiry into later stages of the life cycle. It may be that post-childhood socialization, re-socialization, and de-socialization play a considerably greater role in shaping the universe of attitudes toward civil liberties.

In commenting on the two presentations, Professor Hyman stressed the dramatic nature of Jennings' low intra-family correlations and pointed out that in older studies from the 30's, 40's, and 50's there had been high intra-

family attitudinal correlations. What factors contributed to a decline of attitudinal transmission within the families in the 1960's? The possibility of re-studying some of the adults whom Professor Remmers had studied in early Purdue Opinion Polls in the 1950's was suggested. This might tell us something about the persistence of adolescent attitudes toward civil liberties into the adult years, since Remmers' 1950 high school populations would not be in its early 30's.

Professor Hanan Selvin, of the University of Rochester, then commented that the quality of on-going survey work described in the two presentations frees the Center from any obligation to undertake a national survey. Massive research of this kind is expensive and tedious; more important, the continuation of the Purdue studies and the wide scope of the Survey Research Center organizations, provides more than enough gross national data. It should be the Center's object to undertake small, very specialized studies, which would be inexpensive and which would attempt to answer questions of particular relevance to the Center's educational innovation.

For instance, pairs of interesting communities could be selected which would allow the Center to gauge the impact of its own interventions, and might shed a great deal of light on the way in which community variables affect attitudinal formation in the civil liberties area. When one studies a pair of communities in depth, one can learn a great deal more about the social context and the value climate than one can through a cumbersome national sample. Nuances of social class and the subtle differences in socialization patterns can be pinpointed within several communities in a small study and are of great value to the researcher.

Professor Selvin also presented the conference with certain data gathered from high school students in the Rochester area which seemed to suggest a greater degree of civil liberties sensitivity among students than among their parents.

The next commentator was Dr. Robert Lee, of the International Business Machines Corporation. He believed that the sense of the meeting, with which he agreed, was that the Center should not become involved in large-scale survey research. Enough projects are already underway so that the Center's role should be one of exploiting on-going research in the service of curriculum development, and undertaking smaller pieces of work which it is particularly well fitted to accomplish. In this way, the Center might answer questions of practical importance and also make basic theoretical contributions.

Since Professor Milbrath's research suggested that very insubstantial improvement in libertarian attitudes could be achieved through short-term "lecture" or "discussion" interventions within a regular program, it was suggested that the Center give priority to the development of an integrated educational system with stress on the lower grades so that students reaching high school history, civics, and problems of democracy courses would be psychologically open to exciting and value-laden teaching about liberty, equality, and justice.

The final commentator of the afternoon was Professor Thomas Leidy, who succeeded Professor Remmers as Director of the Purdue Opinion Poll. He reminded the group that the high school teacher and the prospective high school teacher should not be ignored and suggested testing of teacher attitudes. It might be interesting, for instance, for the Center to compare the results of attitudinal testing of the Purdue Opinion Poll type among high school teachers with the curriculum content which they are teaching.

Non-Survey Approaches

The evening sessions met at 8:30 under the chairmanship of Professor Arnold Rogow, of the City College of New York. Before proceeding, he emphasized the importance for attitudinal formation of personality variables. He reminded the conference of work done by Harold Lasswell and others which suggests that a low level of civil liberties sensibilities is associated with an anxiety-ridden and badly integrated personality. There are substantial difficulties encountered in designing research to capitalize upon this theoretical insight, but the psychoanalytical model should not be ignored by the Center in its thinking about attitudinal formation and civil liberties.

Brief presentations were then made by Professor Louis Levine, of San Francisco State College and Yeshiva University, and Professor Erling Schild, of the Johns Hopkins University.

Professor Levine discussed research in which he is presently engaged on the political attitudes of American Negroes and on the attitudes of young people in the civil rights movement. This work is based on depth interviews and reveals a state of frustration and emotional explosiveness of Negroes. It induces considerable pessimism about the stability within Negro communities, given the snail's pace of improvement in ghetto conditions.

Professor Levine went on to argue that a sequential program should be developed by the Center for education about liberties. Such an educational system might begin in the pre-school programs and in the lower grades with systematic re-inforcement of desired behaviors on the part of children. Then, as the child's cognitive potential developed, more and more substantive materials about liberty, equality, and justice could be introduced. In this way, the Center would avoid simply teaching about liberty and would become involved

in shaping behavior. Only through such a coordinated approach, where cognitive input is directly tied to encouraged behavioral patterns, can any long-term improvement in patterns of civil liberty be achieved.

Finally, it was emphasized that the Center should undertake specialized research within selected communities to determine, first, the dimensions of the socialization process, and second, the range of social and political forces which play upon the school. The design of a program where behaviors are reinforced in the early grades and cognitive input is increased in the latter grades would require considerable theoretical understanding of learning process and an equal comprehension of the politics of education in terms of the ways in which social-structural, cultural, and economic differences between communities affect the schools.

Professor Schild related to the group certain experiences which he has recently had in using games as teaching devices. He stressed the dramatic attraction of games and the way in which they engage students affectively. Such affective engagement is the prerequisite of successful cognitive input, and games can be used to prepare the way for sophisticated teaching through lecture and discussion.

The Center might well be able to adapt games to serve also as an instrument of research into the configuration of attitudes and the processes by which attitudes are formed. Such exploratory use of games would be particularly advantageous with younger children and with populations having low verbal skills. Games, in fact, are one of the most promising devices for reaching the nonverbal child who has great difficulty in coming to grips with abstractions.

The first comment was by Professor Edgar Z. Friedenberg, of the University of California at Davis, who agreed with the view that the Center should not

undertake large-scale survey research, but should restrict itself to more limited research endeavors which would be of a highly imaginative character and take advantage of a wide range of possible techniques.

One approach for answering questions concerning the environment of the school is ethnological; the investigator immerses himself in the environment and through intimate acquaintance with its texture is able to arrive at a sensitive understanding of its complexities. This ethnological method is not qualitatively rigorous, because in the sense that the data produced are not subject to quantitative manipulation, but loss in rigor is more than recompensed by the gain in subtlety.

It was noted that in educational innovation, the best work is often done by "educational artists" who give free play to their cultivated intuition rather than proceeding on the basis of systematic testing and retesting. One should not discount the contributions which could be made through the rigorous manipulation of quantifiable data, but the Center would be stronger for taking advantage of a variety of differently derived insights into learning and the structure of the school.

The second and final commentator of the evening was Mr. Lawrence Rogin, of the AFL-CIO, who dissented mildly from the emerging emphasis of the meeting on research into learning and early childhood, and on the development of educational systems stressing early learning. Granted the importance of this research, the Center must not overlook the importance of adult education. This experience indicates that the educator must be careful to choose strategic populations with affective involvements which open them to instruction and discussion of values. Significant changes in attitudes can be effected quite late in life.

In concluding, Mr. Rogin stressed the importance of the Center's undertaking specialized research in the politics of education, and its attempting to develop a theory of the position of the school within various sorts of communities.

Review and Recommendations

The final session of the conference was called to order on Sunday morning, by Professor Westin, who explained to the group in detail the Center's plans for the next four years. He presented an outline of the ways in which our basic program of scholarship on the problems of civil liberties and social change would develop, and projected the lead-times for the Center's development of curriculum materials and for their testing in pilot programs.

A general discussion ensued and the group seemed to agree that the Center should undertake specialized research into attitudes concerning civil liberties, at the same time that its basic scholarship and curriculum development were vigorously pressed. While it was recognized that survey research techniques could be profitably utilized, especially in assessing the impact of particular interventions by the Center into the educational process, efforts should be made to modify and supplement surveys in an effort to develop approaches tailored to the particular problems which the Center must investigate.

It was pointed out that there is not reason why survey questions need be shallow and unsophisticated, and that depth interviewing can be harnessed to the survey technique with the results of the interview coded in various ways and rigorously manipulated. It seemed agreed that such other techniques as games, ethnological exploration, and non-responsive inquiry should be used with surveys to produce richer and more controlled results whenever possible.

It seemed the conclusion of the group that the political learning process, especially in the early years, and the politics and sociology of the school should be major research targets of the Center over the next three years.

V. THEMES OF CONFERENCE DISCUSSIONS

At each of the Saturday sessions and after Professor Westin's remarks to the Sunday morning session, there were lively informal discussions of the suggestions made by participants and of the assumptions underlying the Center's organization and work. In order to unravel the most interesting threads running through these conversations, it is necessary to organize the report topically rather than chronologically. In many cases, a point made at one session went unanswered for half a day before being picked up, commented upon, and reworked by some other participant. What follows, then, has an artificial crispness which necessarily sacrifices some of the richness of the discussions and does not reflect the dialectical or evolutionary process by which the principle themes of the conference were brought into sharper intellectual focus.

Perhaps the most basic question regarding research into the attitudes of young people came from Mr. W. H. Ferry of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

Ferry: In the Fund for the Republic, we spent a great amount of money on research. We hoped that this would lead us toward some direct action to improve the climate of civil liberties in America, but it didn't turn out that way. I have been trying to dissuade Mr. Westin from spending money on social scientists at all. Say you found out about what is going on in the high schools. What are you going to do about it? To what action does this lead you? We spent over one million dollars on such things and really couldn't figure out what to do with the results except publish them. My advice is to crank up the machine and get something going in some schools.

Lipset: I agree with Mr. Ferry that a lot of research is bad and doesn't help us as social and educational innovators. However, if we are going to go into the school, we have to be concerned about the political and social environment of the schools. I don't know that the schools can be changed, but they certainly can't be changed unless we understand the power relationships of the community, young people's attitudes, and parents attitudes.

Levine: In point of fact, there has been little empirical research on public school systems as political structures. Now I think the question here is why this sort of research has not been undertaken. If we could really consider this question, we confront the fact that, first, this type of research

does not pay off professionally; and second, it is hazardous to us--it might expose us politically and it could be challenged by our colleagues as somehow reflecting a partisan position not in keeping with the cherished fictions of scientific objectivity.

Jennings: It would be unfortunate if anyone went away from this table believing that sufficient research has been done in the processes of political learning, and that the Center should ignore attitudinal research completely and get on with its basic scholarship and curriculum development. Until the publication in 1959 of Herbert Hyman's Political Socialization, the term was not even in general use. This area of inquiry is just beginning to be opened up, and while it would probably not be useful for the Center to conduct national surveys, it certainly would do specialized attitudinal research at the same time that it develops curriculum. A great deal of past experimentation in the schools we now know to have been based on completely inadequate knowledge of human behavior and learning. If the Center is not to repeat such mistakes, it must act on considered theoretical assumptions, and not hesitate to design and carry out work when it comes upon interesting questions.

Another interesting exchange of views involved the extent to which it is reasonable to expect that any but a narrow class of elites can be brought to an understanding of the delicate rationale of civil liberties, and the extent to which mass commitment to civil liberties norms is necessary to the functioning of a libertarian society.

Lipset: Of course you could not get a majority vote today for the Bill of Rights--it is unreasonable to expect this. The idea, for example, that a rapist or a traitor should have the right not to be forced to testify about his crimes will strike the average person absurd. There is a very complicated theoretical and philosophical structure which underlies due process of law and you can't expect more than a small proportion of the population ever to understand this. What makes a libertarian society is the commitment of its leading elites to civil liberties norms, and their insistence on these norms in the face of popular apathy or hostility.

Frey: As a student of comparative politics I am troubled by Professor Lipset's emphasis on "elite insistence" as a durable guarantee of civil liberties in a society. It makes me uneasy that so much of the progress in civil liberties in the United States has come from the Supreme Court. I see elite insistence on civil liberties as one stage through which a society progresses to a plateau on which civil liberties norms are more generally understood and broadly subscribed to within the population. It seems to me that elite insistence is only a half-way house to something better. It is inherently unstable, and must sooner or later produce some sympathetic resonances in the population or be swept away.

Several times the conversations focused on the pious neutrality which often characterizes teaching in the schools about politics and social conflict.

Lipset: It is, perhaps, something to be said of the practice of certain European schools and universities of appointing political and ideological partisans on the theory that student sophistication will result from the clashes of faculty opinion. In America, there is too much sterile neutrality in education.

Stahmer: Objectivity is a false value. It is unfortunate in our society that neutrality is so often acquainted with respectability.

The relationship between intelligence and liberality, remarked on by Professor Bay in the opening presentation at the morning session, was examined and discussed at several points.

Milbrath: I am fascinated by the notion that authoritarian attitudes and repressive responses are related to the intellectual capacity to differentiate and discriminate between superficially similar things. There is an interesting parallel between the child and the authoritarian adult to the extent that both have trouble making the same kinds of fine discriminations.

Frey: I have been studying Turkish peasants for all too long, and I have also been studying American adolescents. I am quite impressed by the similarities in one regard. The Turkish peasants have little respect for civil liberties or, for that matter, for other people. This is really due to cognitive barriers, and I should argue that psychologically, one of the major factors making for libertarian attitudes is the capacity to put oneself in another person's place. The peasant, with his terribly constricted life situation and his narrow perspective has great difficulty in this regard. Many young people suffer a similar difficulty. Empathy is related to the richness of an individual's experience, and especially to his experience with change. The school, perhaps, should be less concerned with inculcating specific norms and more concerned with enhancing the cognitive range of its charges. Flexibility is intimately related to civil liberties.

Schild: One related point which I would like to pursue. An assertion has been made at several points in our discussions that I am not at all sure about. This is the assumption that discipline and structure in the family and in the school generate anti-libertarian behavior. Is this really so? I went to school in Denmark where the schools are exceedingly authoritarian and I don't think anyone would argue that the Danes are anti-libertarian.

A very interesting discussion developed on the question of games both as teaching devices and as tools for exploration of existing civil liberties attitudes.

Westin: I am excited about the possibility of games as tools for learning and attitudinal research. However, I see one very great difficulty with their use in the civil liberties area. The point of the game is to win--for the individual player to maximize his holdings (of power, of territory, or of influence) and to minimize his losses. Yet there is an element of altruism or compassion involved in the idea of civil liberties, and it is difficult to see how this could be built into the inherently competitive and achievement-oriented structure of a game. Even if we assume a completely utilitarian rationale for civil liberties, by which respect for others accrues to the eventual benefit of society, the question still arises "Who plays society?"

Schild: Of course, a game can be designed so as to punish the player if he exerts all of the power which he formerly possesses. In other words you can arrange for a player to suffer long-range losses as a punishment for rash or unexpedient exercises of power.

Westin: I can see this in the civil rights area. If Negroes are not afforded justice they will burn down the cities. But in the civil liberties area, when you survey the sorts of people who are making claims, what have you got--rapists, kidnappers, traitors and libertines. Not exactly community influentials, and not organized for action. They can't punish their opponents.

Friedenberg: What you are really saying is that there isn't any game of "gentlemen" because gentlemenly behavior is antithetical to the competitive and aquisitive nature of the game.

APPENDIX I

AGENDA

CONFERENCE ON YOUNG PEOPLE'S ATTITUDES TOWARD AMERICAN LIBERTIES

MOTEL ON THE MOUNTAIN
October 21 - 23, 1966

CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND EDUCATION IN AMERICAN LIBERTIES

Friday

5:00 - 6:30 p.m. — Cocktails - Terrace Room

6:30 - 8:00 — Dinner - Main Dining Room

8:30 - 10:30 — General Session - Motel Conference Room

Welcome: Mrs. Minna Post Peyser, Associate Director of the Center

Address: "Civil Liberties and Social Change"
Professor Alan F. Westin, Director of the Center

Saturday

8:00 - 9:00 a.m. — Breakfast - Main Dining Room

9:30 - 12:00 noon — General Session - Motel Conference Room

"Young People's Attitudes Toward American Liberty: The Nature of the Inquiry."

Chairman: Professor Seymour Martin Lipset
Harvard University

Presentations: Professor Christian Bay, University of Alberta, Canada
Professor Lester Milbrath, State University of New York at Buffalo

Opening comments by:

Professor Harold Stahmer, Barnard College

Professor Frederick Frey, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Professor Kurt Lang, State University of New York at Stony Brook

AGENDA (Cont'd.)

12:30 - 1:30 p.m. Lunch - Main Dining Room

2:00 - 5:00 General Session - Motel Conference Room

"Survey Techniques for Investigating Young People's Attitudes Toward American Liberties"

Chairman: Professor Herbert Hyman, Columbia University

Presentations: Professor H. H. Remmers, Professor Emeritus, Purdue University

Professor M. Kent Jennings, Survey Research Center, University of Michigan

Opening Comments by:

Professor Hanan Selvin, University of Rochester

Dr. Robert S. Lee, International Business Machines Corporation

Professor Thomas R. Leidy, Purdue University

6:00 - 8:00 Dinner - Main Dining Room

8:30 - 10:30 General Session - Motel Conference Room

"Non-Survey Techniques for Investigating Young People's Attitudes Toward American Liberties"

Chairman: Professor Arnold Rogow, The City College of New York

Presentations: Professor Louis Levine, Yeshiva University

Professor Erling Schild, The Johns Hopkins University

Opening Comments by:

Professor Edgar Z. Friedenberg, University of California at Davis

Mr. Lawrence Rogin, Department of Education, AFL-CIO, Washington, D. C.

AGENDA (Cont'd.)

Sunday - October 23rd

8:00 - 9:00 a.m.	Breakfast - Main Dining Room
9:30 - 12:00 noon	General Session - Motel Conference Room
	"Inventory and Prospects"
	Chairman: Professor Alan F. Westin, Director, Center for Research and Education in American Liberties
	ENTIRE GROUP
12:30	Lunch - Main Dining Room
	END OF CONFERENCE

APPENDIX II

Prepared for
The Conference on Young People's Attitudes
Toward American Liberties

Table 1

H. H. Remmers

Changes in Youths' Civil Liberties Attitudes 1951-1964

	Percentages correct	
	1951	1964
Newspapers and magazines should be allowed to print anything they want except military secrets.	45	25
Religious belief and worship should not be restricted by laws.	79	88
The government should prohibit some people from making public speeches.	53	54
In some cases, the police should be allowed to search a person or his home even though they do not have a warrant.	26	32
Some criminals are so bad that they shouldn't be allowed to have a lawyer.	79	82
Some religious groups should not be allowed the same freedoms as others.	87	93
If a person is accused of a crime he should always have the right to know who is accusing him.	81	82
Certain groups should not be allowed to hold public meetings, even though they gather peaceably and only make speeches.	60	65
Foreigners in this country should always be allowed the same basic freedoms that citizens have.	54	57
Local police may sometimes be right in holding persons in jail without telling them of any formal charges against them.	76	79
In some criminal cases a trial by jury is an unnecessary expense and shouldn't be given.	76	84
In some cases the government should have the right to take over a person's land or property without bothering to go to court.	88	91

Table 1 (Continued)

	1951	1954
The police or F. B. I. may sometimes be right in giving a man the "third degree".	27	34
Persons who refuse to testify against themselves..... Should either be made to talk or severely punished.	47	72
Some of the petitions which have been circulated should not be allowed by the government.	34	45
Police and other groups have sometimes banned or censored certain books and movies in their cities. Should they or should they not have power to do this?	27	31
Should or should not a foreigner visiting this country be permitted to criticize our government?	56	62
Some cities have passed laws against printing or selling any Communist literature. Do you think such laws should or should not be passed?	21	30
In peacetime, do you think that members of the Communist Party in this country should be allowed to speak on the radio?	20	25
Do you think that a person suspected of being a Communist should be fired from his job even if there is no proof that he is actually a Communist?	79	83

NOTES

1. T. W. Adorno, et al., The Authoritarian Personality (New York: Harper, 1950.)

2. Much of the data collected by the Roper, Gallup and other commercial survey organizations are available at the Roper Center at Williams College, Williamstown, Massachusetts. For an excellent rendering of much of the early data, see H. Cantril et al., Gauging Public Opinion (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1944).

3. Examples of these are D. Easton and R. Hess, "The Child's Political World," 6 Midwest Journal of Political Science 229 (1962); H. Hyman and P. Sheatsley, "Trends in Public Opinion on Civil Liberties," 9 Journal of Social Issues 6 (1953); and H. Selvin and W. Hagstrom, "Determinants of Support for Civil Liberties," 11 The British Journal of Sociology 51 (1960).

4. An excellent example of non-reactive and non-quantitative investigation of attitudes is E. Friedenberg's Coming of Age in America (New York: Random House, 1963). See also F. Kluckhohn, "The Participant Observer Technique in Small Communities," 46 American Journal of Sociology 331 (1940).

5. H. Hyman, Political Socialization (Glencoe: Free Press, 1959).

THE LIBRARY OF
SEP 14 1967
CONTINUING EDUCATION